



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,366	03/31/2004	Michael D. Shipshock	CS22395RL	7765
20280	7590	06/20/2007	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA INC			DAGLAWI, AMAR A	
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ROOM AS437			2618	
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/20/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/814,366	SHIPSHOCK, MICHAEL D.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Amar Daglawi	2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2004.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/31/2004, 07/11/2005.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first

paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The recitation "atd\*99# AT" is not supported in the specification disclosed by applicant, appropriate correction is required.

Claims 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recitations "atd\*99# AT" is vague and indefinite because it doesn't have a clear and definite meaning when construed in the context of the specification and drawings.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6, 7-8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siikaniemi (US 2002/0087701 A1) in view of Lord et al (US 6,763,012 B1).

With respect to claim 1, Siikaniemi discloses a mobile station (Fig.6) comprising:

A first wireless transceiver (Fig.6, MT) for communicating with a wireless network (Fig.6, par [0034], par [0035]) [The GPRS is the network];

A menu for selecting one of a plurality of packet data context settings and establishing a packet data context in accordance therewith (par [0035], [the

interface is the menu where the CPUMT implements applications WAP, APPMT, and the packet data context is the PDP (packet data protocol) activation]).

However, Siikaniemi fails to expressly teach a second wireless transceiver for communicating with a remote device.

In the same field of endeavor Lord teaches a mobile terminal and method of providing a network-to-network connection (Abstract) where an MT (second wireless transceiver) connects to a plurality each having a unique IP address through a single wireless link to a PDN (col.2, lines 32-58).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the MT (mobile station that includes first transceiver) as taught by Siikaniemi with a second transceiver as taught by Lord so as to connect the terminal (TE) (remote device) as further taught by Siikaniemi.

With respect to claim 2, Siikaniemi in view of Lord further teaches a second transceiver is a wireless transceiver (col.2, lines 32-58, Fig.1).

With respect to claim 3, Siikaniemi in view of Lord further teaches each of said plurality of packet data context settings comprises an access point name and a quality of service parameter (par [0028]).

With respect to claim 4, Siikaniemi discloses a mobile station (Fig.6) comprising:

A first wireless transceiver (Fig.6, MT) for communicating with a wireless network (Fig.6, par [0034], par [0035]) [The GPRS is the network];

A default packet data context setting for establishing a packet data context in accordance with said setting upon power up of said mobile station (Fig.3, par [0028]-[0030]) [the PDP is automatically activated when the MS attaches to the GPRS network which indicates that the mobile station MT is power up since it is connected].

However, Siikaniemi fails to expressly teach a second wireless transceiver for communicating with a remote device.

In the same field of endeavor Lord teaches a mobile terminal and method of providing a network-to-network connection (Abstract) where an MT (second wireless transceiver) connects to a plurality each having a unique IP address through a single wireless link to a PDN (col.2, lines 32-58).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the MT (mobile station that includes first transceiver) as taught by Siikaniemi with a second transceiver as taught by Lord so as to connect the terminal (TE) (remote device) as further taught by Siikaniemi.

With respect to claim 5, Siikaniemi in view of Lord further teaches a second transceiver is a wireless transceiver (col.2, lines 32-58, Fig.1).

With respect to claim 6, Siikaniemi in view of Lord further teaches each of said plurality of packet data context settings comprises an access point name and a quality of service parameter (par [0028]).

With respect to claim 7, Siikaniemi discloses a method of establishing packet data service for a remote device (Fig.3) comprising:

transmitting by a mobile station a packet data context request to a network (Fig.3, par [0022]-[0024]);

receiving from said network a packet data context activation confirmation and at least one internet protocol address (Fig.3, par [0024]-[0025])[In a GPRS system using GSM the message transmitted is an IP packet];

receiving by said mobile station a connect request from a remote device (Fig.5, par [0032])

establishing a communications link between said mobile station and said remote device (Fig.5, par [0032]);

However, Siikaniemi fails to expressly teach providing packet data service to said remote device using said at least one internet protocol address.

In the same field of endeavor Lord teaches a mobile terminal and method of providing a network-to-network connection (Abstract) where the PPPoE stack connects the MT to the plurality of devices on the LAN, receives an indication from each individual device on the LAN whether the device requires an IP address and distributes IP addresses to the plurality of devices on the LAN (col.2, lines 50-58).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the signaling diagram of Fig.3 as taught by Siikaniemi with sending IP addresses to the plurality of devices on the LAN as

taught by Lord so as to provide an IP address the TE as further taught by Siikaniemi (Fig.1).

With respect to claim 8, Siikaniemi as modified by Lord further teaches said network is a GPRS network (par [0033]).

With respect to claim 10, Siikaniemi as modified by Lord further teaches said connect request is an atd\*99#AT command (par [0023]-[0024]).

With respect to claim 11, Siikaniemi as modified by Lord further teaches said communications link is a Point-to-Point Protocol link (par [0032]).

With respect to claim 12, Siikaniemi as modified by Lord further teaches said remote device is one of a personal digital assistant, personal computer, music file player, and video player (Fig.1)

With respect to claim 15, Siikaniemi discloses a method of establishing packet data service for a remote device (Fig.3) comprising:

receiving by a mobile station, a command to establish a packet data context corresponding to one of a plurality of selectable packet data context configurations (Fig.3, par [0023]);

transmitting by said mobile station a packet data context request to a network wherein said packet data context request corresponds to said command (Fig.3, par [0022]-[0024]);

receiving from said network a packet data context activation confirmation and at least one internet protocol address (Fig.5, par [0032]);

receiving by said mobile station a connect request from said remote device

(Fig.5, par [0032]);

establishing a communications link between said mobile station and said remote device (Fig.5, par [0032]);

However, Siikaniemi fails to expressly teach providing packet data service to said remote device using said at least one internet protocol address.

In the same field of endeavor Lord teaches a mobile terminal and method of providing a network-to-network connection (Abstract) where the PPPoE stack connects the MT to the plurality of devices on the LAN, receives an indication from each individual device on the LAN whether the device requires an IP address and distributes IP addresses to the plurality of devices on the LAN (col.2, lines 50-58).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the signaling diagram of Fig.3 as taught by Siikaniemi with sending IP addresses to the plurality of devices on the LAN as taught by Lord so as to provide an IP address the TE as further taught by Siikaniemi (Fig.1).

With respect to claim 16, Siikaniemi as modified by Lord further teaches said network is a GPRS network (par [0033]).

With respect to claim 18, Siikaniemi as modified by Lord further teaches said connect request is an atd\*99#AT command (par [0023]-[0024]).

With respect to claim 19, Siikaniemi as modified by Lord further teaches said communications link is a Point-to-Point Protocol link (par [0032]).

With respect to claim 20, Siikaniemi as modified by Lord further teaches said remote device is one of a personal digital assistant, personal computer, music file player, and video player (Fig.1)

Claims 9 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siikaniemi in view of Lord as applied to claim 7 and 15 above, and further in view of Lantto (US 2004/0054794 A1).

With respect to claims 9 and 17, Siikaniemi as modified by Lord further teaches all the limitations of claim 7 except for the internet protocol address is a DNS IP address.

In the same field of endeavor Lantto teaches a method and arrangement to secure access to a communications network where the SGSN will query the Domain Name Service for the APN and the DNS returns an IP address for the GGSN (par [0153]-[0154]).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the signaling diagram (Fig.3) as taught by Siikaniemi in view of Lord with the DNS IP address as taught by Lantto so as to provide a DNS IP address to the TE (remote device) as taught by Lord.

Claims 13, 14, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siikaniemi in view of Lord as applied to claims 7 and 15 above, and further in view of Barnes, Jr (US 2007/0118426 A1).

With respect to claims 13, 14, 21 and 22, Siikaniemi as modified by Lord teaches all the limitations of claims 7 and 15 with exception to said music file

player is an MP3 player and said video player is an MPEG player which is further taught by Branes Jr (par [0032]-[0033]).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the TE (remote device) as taught by Siikaniemi in view of Lord with a the audio/video player (MP3 and MPEG player) as taught by Barnes so as to play sound and video files.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nasielski et al (US 2005/0266842 A1) teaches a method and apparatus for CDMA2000/GPRS roaming.

Chaskar (US 2002/0122432 A1) teaches a method and apparatus for communicating data based on a plurality of traffic classes.

Josse et al (US 6,104,929) teaches a data packet radio service with enhanced mobility management.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amar Daglawi whose telephone number is 571-270-1221. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday (7:30 AM- 5:00 AM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on 571-272-7884. The fax


phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Amar Daglawi



EDAN ORGAD  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER



6/20/07